

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges that newly submitted claims 79-269 have been withdrawn from consideration. In consideration of the Examiner, below is the current status of the claims of the present re-issue application:

1-50	canceled by Preliminary Amendment July 2001;
51	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001, amended herein;
52	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001;
53-54	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001, amended herein;
55-63	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001;
64	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001, canceled herein;
65	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001, amended herein;
66	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001;
67-68	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001, amended herein;
69-77	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001;
78	added by Preliminary Amendment July 2001, canceled herein; and
79-269	added by Preliminary Amendment June 2003, canceled herein.

Claims 51-59 and 61-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Langford *et al.* ('929). For the reasons set forth hereinbelow, Applicant contends that the Examiner has misinterpreted aspects of the Langford reference.

By way of a succinct review, Langford *et al.* disclose a "post-production off-line editing system" that enables the user to assemble a collection of program segments into a final program, based on an edit decision list derived using the system. The system includes the use of a programmed personal computer to provide a graphical interface that enables the user to create the edit decision list, in conjunction with special software and appropriate external hardware enabled to perform image manipulations ranging from simple cut/splice edits to sophisticated fades and special effects. Tape or film segments are first copied to video discs for use as random-access program material sources in the system.

When operated in "single-camera mode," the user is able to assemble various program segments, applying user-selected effects at the transition points ("splices"). When operated in "multiple-camera mode," there are additional features available which enable the user to more efficiently manage the stored program segments and thereby produce the final edited program.

Regarding claims 51 and 52, the Examiner argues that "the decision list [of Langford *et al.*] includes both the edit time codes and scripting, staging or scene composition information," citing

column 7, lines 33-37. However, Applicant contends that the passage cited by the Examiner provides insufficient disclosure for the purposes of rejection. The pertinent section reads as follows:

“The edit decision lists includes time codes identifying the splices between edits on the list, codes identifying the type of each splice (i.e., white, dissolve, fade or simple cut); and user-entered descriptions of the edits on the list.”

This disclosure has only to do with the manipulation of the splices themselves, and not with any extrinsic instructions regarding scripting, casting or staging. While the cited passage does refer to “user-entered descriptions of the edits on the list,” again, this has to do with the *edits*, and not with scripting, casting or staging information. Given the absence of this disclosure alone defeats *prima facie* obviousness.

Although Applicant contends that the claims dependant upon independent claim 51 are allowable as well in that they include additional limitations, Applicant would like to comment on a couple of these claims.

Regarding claim 53, the Examiner has indicated that in the multiple-camera mode (citing 14:66 – 15:18), “the edit decision list controls the selection of a plurality of video camera views, which meets the camera positioning or orientation control as claimed.” This is not the case. Langford *et al.* only disclose a graphical interface with means to select one of multiple simultaneously displayed camera views as part of the editing process. The ‘929 patent does not, in any way, suggest actual control of a camera itself (i.e., functions such as pan/tilt, zoom, iris control, *etc.*). The Examiner is assuming a bi-directional flow of information where none has been disclosed or suggested.

Regarding claim 54, the Examiner suggests that “the scene tracker utilized by the edit decision list meets the props or actors positioning, orientation, or physical characteristics as claimed (7:1-20, 7:44-49).” This also is not evident from the reference. The information gathered by the scene tracker is wholly driven by the content available in the scene as it has been recorded. There is no ability for the scene tracker to direct the content of the scene. Again, the Examiner is assuming a bi-directional flow of information where none has been disclosed or suggested.

Claims 60 and 65-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Langford *et al.* With regard to claim 60, the Examiner concedes that Langford does not specify that the recording

apparatus forms part of the camcorder. However, Applicant disagrees that the selection of the camcorder would have been considered an obvious design choice, since the Langford disclosure is strictly limited to a post-production offline editing system, and not a camcorder.

Regarding independent claim 65, the Examiner concedes that Langford fails to specify the step of recording source material in digitally compressed form. Although the use of compression is well known in some instances, claim 65 includes numerous other limitations, including the receipt of computer-readable scripting, casting or staging information (as amended). Accordingly, claim 65, as well as claims 66-78, should be allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 51 and its dependencies.

Based upon the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicants believe all claims are in condition for allowance. Questions regarding this application may be directed to the undersigned attorney at the telephone/facsimile numbers provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John G. Posa  
Reg. No. 37,424  
Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle,  
Anderson & Citkowski, PC  
280 N. Old Woodward Ave., Ste 400  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(734) 913-9300 FAX (734) 913-6007

Dated: August 19, 2004